

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner issued a final rejection of Claims 1-34, which are all of the pending claims, over the prior art. In particular, Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 17 and 29-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,584,378 (Satterfield, et al.). Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Satterfield, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,563,515 (Reynolds, et al.); and Claims 18-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,623,613 (Rowe, et al.) in view of Satterfield, et al.

Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 be amended to better define the subject matters of these claims.

For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 17 and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and the rejections of Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 18-28 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow Claims 1-34.

As discussed in detail in the present application, this invention provides procedures for monitoring or representing various aspects of video-on-demand services. In one aspect, a tree representation, including branches and nodes, is used to represent and monitor features of the video-on-demand system. Preferably, this aspect of the invention is used to provide multilevel information about the video-on-demand system. A display showing a tree having a plurality of nodes may be generated, and information about video-on-demand services is embedded in these nodes. Preferably, the nodes may include information about the equipment employed to provide the video-on-demand services, the users, or the video-on-demand programs themselves.

With a second aspect of the present invention, a matrix is established from a pair of catalogs of elements of a video-on-demand system. In this matrix, connection representations are formed for at least some of the cells of the matrix. The connection representations are preferably used to represent a range of relationships; and, for example, these connections may be used to illustrate relationships between users and presentations, or between the video-on-demand equipment.

The prior art relied on by the Examiner to reject the claims disclose various types of television program guides.

For instance, Satterfield, et al. describes an interactive television program guide that may be used to show a browsing display screen. This browsing display screen includes a list of current programs, and a video window that shows a television program that the user is currently watching. An important feature of the Satterfield, et al. system is that the user can look at information about several programs without changing the program being shown in the video window.

Reynolds, et al. describes a television program guide that supports a video window function that may be used when browsing for available television programs. A viewer may use the program guide to display a window that contains video for a program currently being broadcast on another channel or a video clip of a program to be shown sometime in the future. The viewer may learn about available programming by browsing through channels on the program guide. Columns 11 and 12 of Reynolds, et al. describes a browser feature for programming that may be available on demand.

Rowe, et al. also discloses a video programming guide. This guide allows a user to view information by genre groupings rather than by a time-based schedule.

There is, thus, a very important difference between the present invention and the methods and systems disclosed in Satterfield, et al, Reynolds, et al. and Rowe, et al. Specifically, this invention is directed to showing information about relationships between different elements or aspects of a video on demand system; while the above-discussed prior art is directed more toward television programming guides.

Applicants herein ask that Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 be amended to more clearly describe this difference, and specifically, these claims are being amended to describe what is meant, in the claims, by video-on-demand services or system. For example, Claim 1 is herein being amended to set forth positively the step of providing a video-on-demand service system, wherein customers are able to choose interactively various programs stored in a video source and can view a selected program at any time. Similarly, the preambles of Claims 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 are being amended to indicate that the video-on-demand services referred to in the claims enable customers to choose interactively various programs stored in a video source and enable customers to view a selected program at any time.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and it is believed that these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, are no more pertinent than Satterfield, et al, Reynolds, et al. or Rowe, et al.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is anticipated by or is obvious in view of the prior art. Accordingly, Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 and 34 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable

therewith; Claims 7-10 are dependent from Claim 6 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 12-16 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 11.

Similarly, Claims 19-23 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 18; Claims 26-28 are dependent from Claim 25 and are allowable therewith; and Claim 30 is dependent from, and is allowable with, Claim 29. Also, Claims 17, 24 and 31 incorporate by reference, and are allowable with, Claims 1, 18 and 30 respectively. Claims 31-33 are dependent from Claim 30 and are allowable therewith.

The amendments requested herein only elaborate on features already set forth in the claims. More specifically, the claims presently refer to a video-on-demand service or system, and the claims are being amended to indicate with more particularity what is meant by a video-on-demand system or service. Moreover, the last Office Action was the first time that the Examiner applied Satterfield, et al, and it is believed that Applicants should have an opportunity to respond to the use of this reference. It is, hence, believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 17 and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejection of Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 18-28 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-34.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:gcjw